UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/612,142	07/07/2000	Ronald Glen Feigen	IRI05275	7805

22863	7590	02/23/2004

MOTOROLA, INC.
CORPORATE LAW DEPARTMENT - #56-238
3102 NORTH 56TH STREET
PHOENIX, AZ 85018

EXAMINER
NALVEN, ANDREW L

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2134	3

DATE MAILED: 02/23/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.		Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	09/612,142		FEIGEN ET AL.
	Examiner		Art Unit
	Andrew L Nalven		2134

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>07 July 2000</u>.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL.**   2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) <u>1-18</u> is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) <u>1-18</u> is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on <u>07 July 2000</u> is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .

5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1.   Claims 1-18 are pending.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2.   The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

3.   Claims 1-13 and 15-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Reeds III et al US Patent No 5,153,919 (hereafter designated "Reeds"). Reeds teaches a service provision authentication system for mobile phones.

4.   With regards to claims 1, 8-9, and 16-17, Reeds teaches the generating of a random value (Reeds, column 4 lines 52-53), the determining of memory range information identifying a range of memory space within the remote unit having data to be hashed by the hashing function (Reeds, column 4 lines 52-58, column 6 lines 4-9), determining position information indicative of a position within a data stream to be generated within the remote unit at which the random value it to be located (Reeds, column 4 lines 52-58, Figure 2), and delivering the random value, memory range information, and position information to the remote unit for use by the remote unit in performing a hashing operation (Reeds, column 6 lines 4-11).

5.   With regards to claims 2, 12, and 15, Reeds further teaches the receiving of a

hash value from the remote unit in which the hash value is a result of the hashing

operation performed within the remote unit based upon the random value, memory

range information, and position information delivered to the remote unit (Reeds, column

9 line 59 – column 10 line 1).

6.   With regards to claims 3 and 13, Reeds teaches the comparing of the hash value

received from the remote unit to a hash value generated outside the remote unit

(Reeds, column 6 lines 25-34, column 10 lines 3-5).

7.   With regards to claim 4, Reeds teaches the hash value being generated outside

the remote unit within a communication unit that is a replica of the remote unit by

showing identical storage of data (Reeds, column 4 lines 30-49 and column 6 lines 25-

27).

8.   With regards to claim 5, Reeds teaches the hash value generated outside the

remote unit is a result of a hashing operation based upon the random value, memory

range information, and position information (Reeds, column 6 lines 25-34, column 10

lines 3-5).

9.   With regards to claim 6, Reeds teaches the steps of generating, determining

memory range information, and position information is performed in a location different

from the remote unit (Reeds, column 4 lines 50-58).

10.   With regards to claim 7, Reeds teaches a computer readable medium having

program instructions stored thereon for use in implementing the method steps (Reeds,

column 11 line 25 - column 12 line 16).

11.   With regards to claim 10, Reeds teaches the transmitter transmitting the

interrogation message to the remote unit via a communications network (Reeds, Figure

1).

12.   With regards to claim 11, Reeds teaches a local memory storing information

representative of the information that should be stored in the remote unit (Reeds,

column 6 lines 25-27), a hash unit for performing a hashing operation on information

stored within the local memory to generated a control value (Reeds, column 6 lines 25-

34, Figure 2), and the hashing operation being performed using the random value,

memory range information, and position information (Reeds, column 4 lines 30-49 and

column 6 lines 25-27).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

13.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set
> forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and
> the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the
> invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.
> Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

14.   Claims 14 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable

over Reeds III et al US Patent No 5,153,919 in view of Leighton et al US Patent No

5,432,852. Reeds, as described above, fails to teach a selection unit for selecting a

hashing algorithm from a plurality of hashing algorithms. Leighton teaches selecting a

hashing algorithm from a plurality of hashing algorithms for use by the remote unit and

means for indicating the selected hashing algorithm to the remote unit (Leighton,

column 14 lines 60-63). At the time the invention was made, it would have been

obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to use Leighton's method of picking from a

plurality of hashing algorithms because it makes it harder for an attacker to crack the

hashing algorithm (Leighton, column 14 line 63 – column 15 line 7).

Conclusion

15.   The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to

applicant's disclosure.

16.   Trostle et al US Patent No 5,919,257 teaches a network workstation intrusion

detection system that uses hashes to detect intrusions.

17.   Lovelace et al US Patent No 6,263,431 teaches an operating system bootstrap

security mechanism.

18.   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Andrew L Nalven whose telephone number is 703 305

8407. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Thursday 8-6, Alternate

Fridays.

        If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Gregory Morse can be reached on 703 308 4789. The fax phone number

for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the

Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

***

Andrew Nalven

MATTHEW SMITHERS
PRIMARY EXAMINER
Art Unit 2137